



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but Saul of Tarsus did, and the more closely he followed them, the more clearly he saw that it was so, and the more firmly he persecuted, because he believed that they erred in their fundamental argument or rather presupposition, that Jesus was Christ. The only change, therefore, made in his position by his conversion was that he was convinced that this fundamental presupposition was correct. All his own arguments as to the logical result of the Christian positions remained; he altered none of them; he preached them now as facts which had to be faced in consequence of the revelation which had been made to him, instead of holding them up as terrible examples of the results of the false doctrine of the Nazarenes. There is always a danger of underestimating the importance of Paul's knowledge of Christianity, derived from keen hostile attention to the preaching of the disciples in Jerusalem, and I think that this is far more likely to have been the *Hauptquelle des Paulinismus* than the Logia.

I am really sorry to find so little in this book with which to agree, for Resch's works have always been a source of great instruction and stimulation to my own studies; and, in spite of my failure to be convinced by his arguments, I am sincerely grateful to the writer for this as for his earlier books.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

LEIDEN, HOLLAND.

THE MESSIANIC HOPE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Professor Mathews' volume¹ is an able treatment of a subject of vital concern to the theologian of today. The view is widely current among New Testament scholars that eschatology was of fundamental significance in the thought of Jesus, of Paul, and of early Christians generally; and that this was a Jewish eschatology in source and character, which has been contradicted by events and has become impossible to us in the light of our present knowledge of the world. If this is so, if, according to the final decision of New Testament theology, the central and fundamental thing in the thought and teaching of Jesus and in that of Paul is a thing which we cannot accept, then is not every effort to construct a Christian doctrine for today on the basis of the New Testament precluded? Indeed, is not Christian faith undermined? Can we still worship as Master and Lord one whose fundamental conceptions of the kingdom of God and of his own calling as Messiah were mistaken? Those who still think that a Christian doctrine can be derived from the New Testament and based in good part

¹ *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*. By Shailer Mathews. [= "The Decennial Publications," second Series, Vol. XII.] Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905. xx+338 pages. \$2.50 net.

upon it, and who still believe the words of the Master to be truth and life, may use either of two means of escape from the critical situation thus created. They may question, on historical grounds, the fundamental place of messianic eschatology in the mind of Jesus and of Paul, or at least in the mind of Jesus; or, admitting its fundamental and central place, they may seek to show that there is a foundation beneath this foundation, a center within this center, a substance of which this is the form. Various combinations of these two means of escape are of course possible. Professor Mathews chooses chiefly the second means. Acknowledging in the fullest measure the importance of the messianic hope to Jesus and to the New Testament writers, he seeks to show that the eternal Christian verities remain secure, though we reject the form in which they were chiefly expressed, a form inevitable in New Testament times, and to the founders of Christianity inseparable from the truth itself. Professor Mathews adopts the view, which has now many advocates, especially in Germany, that the kingdom of God was to Jesus primarily eschatological. It belongs, properly speaking, to the coming new age. He also holds with a smaller, but not inconsiderable, number of scholars that the messianic confession of Jesus' disciples, and even the messianic consciousness of Jesus himself, consisted in the conviction, not that he was already the Messiah, but that he was hereafter to come as such and establish the kingdom. This "eschatological messianism" is the center also of primitive Christianity and of Paulinism. Jesus is to Paul the eschatological Christ. Faith is primarily the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ of the eschatological hopes.

Perhaps it adds to the effectiveness of Professor Mathews' main argument that he is so staunch an "eschatologist." For his argument is that what is essential in Jesus and in the New Testament remains when the eschatological element is removed; that after we have done full historical justice to that element, it becomes evident that it is after all only of "interpretative" value. What then is the true foundation beneath this mistaken fundamental conception of Jesus and the apostles? It is to be found in part in the truths which the eschatology itself contained, faith in the rule of God, and in his future dominion over all, and in the life eternal; and, in part, in the fact that the appropriation of the messianic title to Jesus was the only way then available of expressing the reality and degree of his uniqueness, the supremacy of his personality, the finality of his knowledge of God, so that the justification of eschatological language is found less in itself than in him. In Paul also, the author maintains, eschatology, though fundamental, has in reality only interpretative value. He adopts "pharisaic messianism," but it becomes to him a medium of expression

of the new life in Christ. To expound this new life and its ethical and social implications is to set forth essential Paulinism. This is true also of the other New Testament writers. Partly in Jewish messianic terms, partly in the new Greek philosophical formulas—hardly more acceptable than the others to the modern mind—these writers brought to expression their faith in the supremacy of Jesus and in the reality of the eternal life which they experienced in him.

The reviewer would express his complete sympathy with the aim of the book as thus suggested, and in the main with the method in which it pursues that aim; he is, however, inclined to make a larger use of the first means of escape from the difficult situation created by an eschatological interpretation of the thought of Jesus, and to think that the "eschatologists" in their zeal have been carried too far. Professor Mathews himself limits the significance of this element in the mind of Jesus, but it may be doubted whether a clear picture results. The kingdom of God was, he says, to Jesus in its primary and literal sense eschatological, but he used the term also figuratively of the people who were hereafter to belong to the kingdom. In this figurative sense it was already present, though in the literal sense, only future. It was present also in the victory of Jesus over Satan and demons. Again the so-called "future messiahship" theory, which Professor Mathews advocates, does not become clearer and more credible by his modifications of it. The phrase, "Son of man," on which this view of the self-consciousness of Jesus hinges, had, we are told, for him a symbolical meaning, such as its use in Daniel suggests. Its use by Jesus meant that he thought of himself as a type of those who were preparing for the kingdom. In that figurative sense he was already Messiah. He accepted Peter's confession in the eschatological sense in which Peter meant it; but he differed from his disciples in believing that he was already doing messianic work (pp. 96, 115). Nevertheless, the essential and literal element in his messianic consciousness was still the conviction that he was destined to come in the future as Messiah. The reviewer confesses that neither in this nor in any other exposition that he has met does this "future messiahship" become to him a natural or even conceivable interpretation of the consciousness of Jesus. This is a question of historical evidence and psychological interpretation, and is distinct from the further question whether, if this eschatological messiahship is accepted as Jesus' thought about himself, it will be possible for most of us to think, as Professor Mathews does, that it is due to the greatness of the personality of Jesus, and does not impair that greatness (pp. 128, 129).

The book before us is comprehensive in its scheme, including a study

of the messianic element in Judaism, in the teaching of Jesus, in primitive Christianity, in Paul, in later New Testament writers, and in early Christian history. In a book covering so wide a range there are naturally sentences at which the reader puts question marks. One may doubt the influence of a Hellenistic art-impulse upon the production of apocalypses (p. 22). The discussion of the eschatology of Enoch 36-71 hardly does justice to this significant effort to lift the figure of the Messiah up to the level of a transcendent hope (pp. 38-40). It is hard to assent to the judgment that even in the fourth gospel the messianic faith in Jesus is nothing more than an expectation that he would do messianic work in the future (p. 87). There are some inaccuracies in references, as on page 48, note 3, and page 28, note 6, where the correction must be supplied by reference to Bousset, who is again not rightly quoted on page 90, note 2. Wrede's *Messiasgeheimniss* should be seriously dealt with by one who gives messiahship so large a place in the life of Jesus. The summary of his view, on page 84, is misleading.

There is a minor matter of which it may not be amiss to speak. The word "messianism," which is used throughout the book, is one from which the present writer shrinks. If theologians decide to use it, the makers of dictionaries will be obliged to recognize it; but is it a word so needed and so good that this obligation must be imposed upon them?

We close with a reaffirmation of our thorough agreement with the main contents of the book and of its outcome. The messianic apocalyptic element was beyond doubt of great significance in the beginnings of Christianity, and has a large place in the New Testament. We must, unquestionably, clear it away in order to adapt New Testament teachings to our own times, and the clearing must be done by such thorough-going distinctions between form and substance as are here attempted. Setting aside the eschatology, as we have already more freely set aside the cosmology, of the New Testament, we have left, as Professor Mathews points out, the two great essentials of the Christian gospel, the personality of Jesus with its revelation of God and of eternal life, and the new life in and through him. These are the facts of which the messianic eschatology is one embodiment and interpretation. We must substitute forms of expression and interpretation in accordance with our own views of the world and modes of thought and speech, but the facts remain and constitute the abiding truth of the New Testament. It is by no means easy to find new language to take the place of the old, language that shall have the religious value of the old and yet avoid conflict with the rest of our knowledge. No one man will solve all the problems involved in such a restatement, and

no one solution will meet all needs; but we welcome this clear and frank discussion of the problem, and shall look forward to the author's further, more constructive efforts in the book he announces on *The Gospel and the Modern Man*.

FRANK C. PORTER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

RECENT BOOKS ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The problem of the gospel of John, like the problem of Jesus himself, will not down. Interest in it fluctuates, or at least the manifestation of interest shown in published books and articles varies, and the line of battle advances and recedes; but the sun never sets upon an ended contest. Recent months have, as Sanday in his opening lecture remarks, produced a remarkable series of discussions on the subject, articles or books having appeared from Schmiedel, Loisy, Jülicher, Réville, Bacon, Stanton, Drummond. To these Sanday's own volume adds another of first-rate importance, to which there has still later been added the article by Professor Carl Clemen in the October number of the *American Journal of Theology*. These discussions make it evident that, for the moment at least, the tendency to narrow the space between opposing opinions has been checked and reversed; the apostolic influence upon the gospel and the degree of historicity are again being minimized, and the gap between diverse opinions widened. The discussion of the problem is therefore no threshing over of old straw, but eminently opportune.

The present volume¹ bears the familiar marks that are characteristic of all Canon Sanday's work: learning, clearness, fairness to opponents, judiciousness in judgment, conservatism. Yet Sanday's conservatism consists, not in a strenuous adherence to traditional views, but rather in a frankly expressed preference for those views which on the one hand are consistent with the evidence as he interprets it, and on the other involve no serious departure from those conceptions for which the historic church has for centuries stood.

The book has its limitations, mainly such as are imposed by the occasion which gave rise to it. It consists of eight lectures delivered before Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. In the nature of the case, such lectures could not enter into minute discussion of detailed evidence. In some matters, accordingly, notably in respect to

¹ *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation, delivered in the Union Seminary, New York, in October and November, 1904. By William Sanday. New York: Scribner, 1905. xiv + 268 pages. \$1.75 net.